

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates Examiner's review of the above-identified patent application and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Applicant also appreciates the Examiner's remarks noting that claims 5, 6, 9 and 11 contain allowable subject matter.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings stating that the drawings fail to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference signs not mentioned in the description: 10a, 10b and 23. With this amendment, Applicant has amended paragraph [00017] to include the reference numeral "23" which is missing in the description. Applicant respectfully submits that paragraph [00017] already includes reference numerals 10a and 10b. Applicant submits that no new matter was added by the amendment. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection of the claims has been overcome.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1 and 11 stating that it is not clear whether the Applicant intends to claim the combination of the seat and tension mechanism. With this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 11 to make it clear

that Applicant intends to only claim the tension mechanism. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections to claims 1 and 11 have been overcome.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to pointing out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the limitation "said wind-up spool" in line 2 lacks insufficient antecedent basis. With this amendment, Applicant has corrected the antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 9 has been overcome.

Claims 1-4, 7-8 and 10 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bullard (U.S. Patent No 6,116,694). In particular, the Examiner states that the "tension belt tension device adapted to produce more or less tension in said plurality of tension belts" reads on fastener 44a in the '694. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the fasteners 44a and 44b as disclosed in the '694 patent are not adapted to produce more or less tension in the plurality of tension belts as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. In contrast, the fasteners 44a and

In re: Peer Kuster et al.  
Filed: August 13, 2001  
Serial No.: 09/925,518  
Page 10

44b can be used only to fix the belts in a single position to the frame. The use of fasteners 44a and 44b will not allow a user to change either the tension of the belts or the position of the belt's end. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the '694 patent does not disclose or suggest all the elements recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 11, and all claims dependent thereon, are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Peer Kuster et al.

By 

Paul J. Kroon, Jr. Esq.  
Registration No. 51,902  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.  
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301  
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104  
Telephone: (603) 623-5111  
Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date: June 16, 2003